UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/525,658	08/23/2005	Eva Altmann	PA/4-32628A	9142

75074 7590 06/24/2008

NOVARTIS INSTITUTES FOR BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH, INC.
400 TECHNOLOGY SQUARE
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139

EXAMINER	
BALASUBRAMANIAN, VENKATARAMAN	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1624	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/24/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/525,658	ALTMANN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	/Venkataraman Balasubramanian/	1624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 April 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-10* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-10* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Group IV, claims 1-10, drawn to compounds of formula I, compositions and methods of use, wherein the compound of formula I is a compound of Formula IV shown in claim 2, in the reply filed on 4/22/2008 is acknowledged. Claims 1-10 will be examined to the extent they embrace compound of formula IV, composition and method of use.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

1. Recitation of "ester thereof" in claim 1, renders claim 1 and its dependent claims indefinite as it is not clear what is intended by ester. It is not clear what is meant by "ester" and what ester ? And what is structural make-up of this compound. The definition of various substituent groups in the formula already include free acids as well

as esters (see e.g., the definition of R5 which includes 'optionally substituted carboxy'). Therefore, it is not clear what is the difference between the substituent groups already recited and the 'ester' which is specifically recited in line 1. It is not clear whether the ester is meant to be prodrug and if so what is the structural make-up of the prodrug given the formula of compound shown therein.

In addition, prodrugs in general and as noted in specification, are compounds, which undergo in vivo hydrolysis to parent active drugs. In that sense recitation of prodrug is acceptable. However, these claims include esters and therefore it is not clear what is the difference between these variable groups and the prodrug groups. There is clear-cut ambiguity as to what is to be considered as prodrug and what is not. Applicants should note that if the variable groups are prodrug, which are in general inactive but becomes active upon in vivo transformation, then the compound bearing the variable group would be deemed as inactive which is not what the claim recites.

Furthermore, the issue on second paragraph is whether the structures of the claimed compounds are clearly defined. Applicants' "prodrugs" and "esters" are molecules whose structure lie outside the subject matter of formula (I), but upon metabolism in the body are converted to active compounds falling within the structural scope of formula (I). The claim describes the function intended but provides no specific structural guidance to what constitutes a "prodrug" or "esters". Structural formulas, names, or both can accurately describe organic compounds, which are the subject matter of these claims. Attempting to define means by function is not proper when the means can be clearly expressed in terms that are more precise.

2. Regarding claim 1, the recitations "acyl (including both lower alkyl acyl, e.g., formyl, acetyl ...)" (see page 53, line 22); "aryl acyl, e.g., benzoyl"; "a bicyclic structure, e.g., with a benzene or" render the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. Particularly, the terms "including"; "e.g." are not acceptable in a claim. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

3. Claim 4 is indefinite as it depends on claims 11, 12 and 13, which are not in the application.

4. Claims 5 and 8 provide for the use of the compound of formula IV but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

5. Claim 6 is indefinite as it is not clear what is in the composition besides a compound of formula IV. Note a composition requires more than one ingredient A. As recited claim 6 has no pharmaceutically acceptable carrier or inert ingredients. So it is not clear what else is in the composition.

6. Process claim 9 is indefinite as it recites "if desired" in process step v). It is not clear when it is desirable. Its replacement with "optionally" is suggested.

7. Claim 10 is indefinite for more than one reason. Independent claim 10 recites all novel products and processes it is not clear what these novel products are what is the structural make-up of these products and what processes are being referred to. In addition, it appears to be use claim. Claim 10 provides for the use of the compound of

unknown structures but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced. A claim must have all limitations within the claim or should refer to another claim having the limitation. Such is not the case with claim 10.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for making salts of the claimed compounds, does not reasonably provide enablement for making ester or prodrug of the claimed compounds. The claim(s) contains subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art of medicinal chemistry - to use the invention. "The factors to be considered in making an enablement rejection have been summarized as the quantity of experimentation necessary, the amount of direction or guidance presented, the presence or absence of working examples, the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the relative skill of those in that art, the predictability or unpredictability of the art and the breadth of the claims", In re Rainer, 146 USPQ 218 (1965); In re Colianni, 195 USPQ 150, Ex parte Formal, 230 USPQ 546. a) Finding a prodrug is an empirical exercise. Predicting if a certain ester of a claimed alcohol, for example, is in fact a prodrug, and produces the active compound metabolically, in man,

at a therapeutic concentration and at a useful rate is filled with experimental uncertainty. Although attempts have been made to predict drug metabolism 'de novo, this is still an experimental science. For a compound to be a prodrug, it must meet three tests. It must itself be biologically inactive. It must be metabolized to a second substance in a human at a rate and to an extent to produce that second substance at a physiologically meaningful concentration. Thirdly, that second substance must be biologically active. Thus, determining whether a particular compound meets these three criteria in a clinical trial setting requires a large quantity of experimentation.

There is no working example of a prodrug of a compound the formula (IV). The nature of the invention is clinical use of compounds and the pharmacokinetic behavior of substances in the human body. The state of the prodrug art is summarized by Wolff (Medicinal Chemistry). The table on the left side of page 976 outlines the research program to be undertaken to. find a prodrug. The second paragraph in section 10 and the paragraph spanning pages 976-977 indicate the low expectation of success. In that paragraph the difficulties of extrapolating between species are further developed. Since, the prodrug concept is a pharmacokinetic issue, the lack of any standard pharmacokinetic protocol discussed in the last sentence of this paragraph is particularly relevant. Banker (Modem Pharmaceutics) in the first sentence, third paragraph on page 596 states that "extensive development must be undertaken" to find a prodrug. Wolff (Medicinal Chemistry) in the last paragraph on page 975 describes the artisans making Applicants' prodrugs as a collaborative team of synthetic pharmaceutical chemists and metabolism experts. All would have a Ph. D. degree and several years of industrial

experience. It is well established that "the scope of enablement varies inversely degree of unpredictability of the factors involved", 'and physiological activity is generally considered to be an unpredictable factor. See In re Fisher, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970). h) The breadth of the claims includes all of the hundreds of thousands of compounds of formula of claim I as well as the presently unknown list potential prodrug derivatives embraced by the word "prodrug".

Thus, undue experimentation will be required to determine if any particular derivative is, in fact, a prodrug.

MPEP 2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557,1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here. Thus, undue experimentation will be required to make Applicants' invention.

Claims 7, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for treating osteoarthritis and rheumatoid arthritis, does not reasonably provide enablement for treating and preventing various disease and medical conditions in which cathepsin K is implicated as embraced in the claim language. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

In evaluating the enablement question, several factors are to be considered. Note In re Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and Ex parte Forman, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed.

1) The nature of the invention:

The instant claims 7, 8 and 10 are drawn to a method of treating diabetes as well as treating and preventing any or all diseases and medical conditions in general by inhibiting cathepsin K.

The instant claims are drawn to 'a method of treating a patient suffering from or susceptible to a disease or medical condition in which cathepsin K is implicated' and the specification provides that such diseases include diseases involving infection by organisms, tumors, diseases of excessive bone loss, etc. (see page 14). First, the instant claims cover 'diseases' or 'medical conditions' that are known to exist and those that may be discovered in the future, for which there is no enablement provided.

Instant claims, as recited, are reach through claims. A reach through claim is a claim drawn to a mechanistic, receptor binding or enzymatic functionality in general format and thereby reach through a scope of invention for which they lack adequate written description and enabling disclosure in the specification.

In the instant case, based on the cathepsin inhibiting activity by the instant compounds, instant claims reach through inhibiting, treating and preventing any or all

diseases and medical conditions in general and thereby they lack adequate written description and enabling disclosure in the specification.

More specifically, in the instant case, based on the mode of action of instant compounds as inhibitor of cathepsin K, based on limited assay, it is claimed that inhibiting treating and preventing any or all diseases and any or all medical conditions in general, which there is no enabling disclosure.

The specification provides an in vitro assay to determine cathepsin K inhibition activity (see page 13) and the IC50 data for some of the exemplified compounds is provided, however, there is nothing in the disclosure regarding how this in vitro data correlates to the treatment of the disorders intended by the instant claims. A state of the art reference, Wang et al., state that "clinical applications of synthetic cathepsin K inhibitors have been problematic due to a lack of tissue specificity" (see page 74).

The disorders encompassed by the instant claims include "tumors (tumor invasion and tumor metastasis)", which have been proven to be extremely difficult to treat. Further, there is no reasonable basis for assuming that the myriad of compounds embraced by the claims will all share the same physiological properties since they are so structurally dissimilar as to be chemically non-equivalent and there is no basis in the prior art for assuming the same. Note In re Surrey, 151 USPQ 724 regarding sufficiency of disclosure for a Markush group.

Further, there is no disclosure regarding how the patient in need Of such specific protease inhibiting activity is identified and further, how types of tumoral diseases are treated. See MPEP § 2164.03 for enablement requirements in cases directed to

structure-specific arts such as the pharmaceutical art. Receptor activity is generally unpredictable and highly structure specific area, and the data provided of the single compound is insufficient for one of ordinary skill in the art in order to extrapolate to the other compounds of the claims. It is inconceivable as to how the claimed compounds can treat the extremely difficult diseases embraced by the instant claims.

A 'tumor' is anything that causes abnormal tissue growth. That can be growth by cellular proliferation more rapidly than normal, or continued growth after the stimulus that initiated the new growth has ceased, or lack (partial or complete) of structural organization and/or coordination with surrounding tissue. It can be benign or malignant. Thus, such term covers not only all cancers, but also covers precancerous conditions such as lumps, lesions, polyps, etc. The scope of the claims includes treatment of various diseases, which is not adequately enabled solely based on the activity of the compounds provided in the specification. For example the term “cancer” is broad and includes The scope of the claims includes any or all cancer based on the mode of action of the compound of instant claims for which there are no enabling disclosure. In addition, the scope of these claims as recited would include treatment of various cancers such as lung cancer, bone cancer, pancreatic cancer, skin cancer. cancer of the head or neck, cutaneous or intraocular melanoma, uterine cancer, ovarian cancer, rectal cancer, cancer of the anal region. stomach cancer, colon cancer, breast cancer, uterine cancer, carcinoma of the fallopian tubes, carcinoma of the endometrium, carcinoma of the cervix, carcinoma of the vagina, carcinoma of the vulva, Hodgkin's disease, cancer of the esophagus, cancer of the small intestine, cancer of the endocrine

system, cancer of the thyroid gland, cancer of the parathyroid gland, cancer of the adrenal gland, sarcoma of soft tissue, cancer of the urethra, cancer of the penis, prostate cancer, chronic or acute leukemia, lymphocytic lymphomas, cancer of the bladder, cancer of the kidney or ureter, renal cell carcinoma, carcinoma of the renal pelvis, neoplasms of the central nervous system (CNS), primary CNS lymphoma, spinal axis tumors, brain stem glioma, pituitary adenoma, or a combination of one or more of the foregoing cancers, which is not adequately enabled solely based on the activity of the compounds provided in the specification. Moreover many if not most of diseases such as psoriasis, lung cancer, brain cancer, pancreatic cancer, colon cancer etc. are very difficult to treat and despite the fact that there are many anticancer drugs.

No compound has ever been found to treat cancers of all types generally. Since this assertion is contrary to what is known in medicine, proof must be provided that this revolutionary assertion has merits. The existence of such a "silver bullet" is contrary to our present understanding of oncology. Cecil Textbook of Medicine states that "each specific type has unique biologic and clinical features that must be appreciated for proper diagnosis, treatment and study" (see the enclosed article, page 1004). Different types of cancers affect different organs and have different methods of growth and harm to the body. Also see In re Buting, 163 USPQ 689 (CCPA 1969), wherein 'evidence involving a single compound and two types of cancer, was held insufficient to establish the utility of the claims directed to disparate types of cancers'. Thus, it is beyond the skill of oncologists today to get an agent to be effective against cancers generally.

Applicants have not provided any competent evidence or disclosed tests that are

highly predictive for the pharmaceutical use of the instant compounds. Pharmacological activity in general is a very unpredictable area. Note that in cases involving physiological activity such as the instant case, "the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved". See In re Fisher, 427 F.2d 833,839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970).

Proliferative disease would include benign tumors, malignant tumors, polyps, lumps, lesions, other pre-cancerous conditions, psoriasis, leukemia, the hyper proliferation of the gastric epithelium caused by the Helicobacter pylori infection of ulcers.

Inflammation is a process that can take place in virtually any part of the body. There is a vast range of forms that it can take, causes for the problem, and biochemical pathways that mediate the inflammatory reaction. There is no common mechanism by which all, or even most, inflammations arise. Mediators include bradykinin, serotonin, C3a, C5a, histamine, leukotrienes, cytokines, and many, many others. Accordingly, treatments for inflammation are normally tailored to the particular type of inflammation present, as there is no, and there can be no "magic bullet" against inflammation generally.

The "autoimmune diseases" are a process that can take place in virtually any part of the body. There is a vast range of forms that it can take,' causes for the problem, and biochemical pathways that mediate the inflammatory reaction. There are hundreds such diseases, which have fundamentally different mechanisms and different underlying causes. Thus, the scope of claims is extremely broad.

The term " prophylaxis" actually means to prevent spread of a disease (as per Meriam Webster's Dictionary) and there is no disclosure as to how one skilled in the art can reasonably establish the basis and the type of subject to which the instant compounds can be administered in order to have the "prevention" effect. There is no evidence of record, which would enable the skilled artisan in the identification of the people who have the potential of becoming afflicted with the disease(s) or disorder(s) claimed herein.

No compound has ever been found to treat cancers of all types generally. Since this assertion is contrary to what is known in medicine, proof must be provided that this revolutionary assertion has merits. The existence of such a "compound" is contrary to our present understanding of oncology. Cecil Textbook of Medicine states, "each specific type has unique biologic and clinical features that must be appreciated for proper diagnosis, treatment and study" (see the enclosed article, page 1004). Different types of cancers affect different organs and have different methods of growth and harm to the body. Thus, it is beyond the skill of oncologists today to get an agent to be effective against cancers generally. Note substantiation of utility and its scope is required when utility is "speculative", "sufficiently unusual" or not provided. See Ex parte Jovanovics, 211 USPQ 907, 909; In re Langer 183 USPQ 288. Also note Hoffman v. Klaus 9 USPQ 2d 1657 and Ex parte Powers 220 USPQ 925 regarding type of testing needed to support in vivo uses.

The scope of the claims involves thousands and thousand of diseases embraced by the claim language.

There are several disease/disorders and that one class of compound can be used to treat all of them is an incredible finding for which applicants have not provided adequate support in the specification. A reasonable correlation is necessary to demonstrate such utilities. See Ex parte Stevens, 16 USPQ 2d 1379 (BPAI 1990); Ex parte Busse et al., 1 USPQ 2d 1908 (BPAI 1986) (the evidence must be accepted as "showing" such utility, and not "warranting further study").

No compound has ever been found to treat and or prevent any or all diseases and disorders of all types stated above. Since this assertion is contrary to what is known in medicine, proof must be provided that this revolutionary assertion has merits. The existence of such a "compound" is contrary to our present understanding of modern medicine. Each specific disease or disorder has unique biologic and clinical features that must be appreciated for proper diagnosis and treatment. Different diseases affect different organs and have different symptoms. Thus, it is beyond the skill of modern medicine today to get an agent to be effective against all diseases and disorders generally despite the fact that they may common mode of action.

Also, note MPEP 2164.08(b) which states that claims that read on "... significant numbers of inoperative embodiments would render claims nonenabled when the specification does not clearly identify the operative embodiments and undue experimentation is involved in determining those that are operative.". Clearly that is the case here.

Note substantiation of utility and its scope is required when utility is "speculative", "sufficiently unusual" or not provided. See Ex parte Jovanovics, 211 USPQ 907, 909; In

re Langer 183 USPQ 288. Also note Hoffman v. Klaus 9 USPQ 2d 1657 and Ex parte Powers 220 USPQ 925 regarding type of testing needed to support in vivo uses.

Next, applicant's attention is drawn to the Revised Utility and Written Description Guidelines, at 66 FR 1092-1099, 2001 wherein it is emphasized that 'a claimed invention must have a specific and substantial utility'. The disclosure in the instant case is not sufficient to enable the instantly claimed method treating solely based on the cathepsin K inhibiting activity disclosed for the compounds. The state of the art is indicative of the requirement for undue experimentation. The state of the art is indicative of the requirement for undue experimentation. See Hou et al., Arthritis & Rheumatism, 46(3), 663-674, 2002 and Wang et al., International Journal of Pharmaceutics, 277, 73-79, 2004.

2) The state of the prior art:

There are no known compounds of similar structure, which have been demonstrated shown to be useful for treating and preventing all diseases and medical conditions. For example, the notion that a compound could be effective against all or any diseases because of its in interaction with a single target, in the instant case cathespin K, in general is absolutely contrary to our current understanding of pharmacological basis of drug design and treatment of diseases. Furthermore, the prior art search in the related area does not suggest that because of the mode of action of a compound, as cathepsin K inhibitors, it would be useful for all disorders generically embraced in the claim language. See Hou et al., and Wang et al., cited above.

3) The predictability or lack thereof in the art:

As noted above, although there several prior art which teach similar compounds as cathespin inhibitor, they do not teach use of the compound disclosed for treating and preventing any or all diseases and medical conditions, besides arthritis and hence there is no art predictability or assurance that instant compound would do so. Pharmacological activity in general is a very unpredictable area. Note that in cases involving physiological activity such as the instant case, "the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved". See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970).

4) The amount of direction or guidance present:

Specification provides no guidance or direction as to how would one use the instant compound to treat and prevent all or any disorder besides arthritis.

5) The presence or absence of working examples:

There are working examples to show that how the instant compound could be used to treat all disorders wherein cathespin K is implicated as causative agent.

6.The breadth of the claim:

The breadth of the claim, with given large genus outlined above, is broad enough to include treating and preventing any or all diseases including those yet to be discovered for which there is no pharmacological basis or showing in the specification.

7) The quantity of experimentation needed:

The quantity of experimentation needed would be an undue burden to one skilled in the pharmaceutical arts since there is inadequate guidance given to the skilled artisan for the many reasons stated above.

Thus, factors such as "sufficient working examples", "the level of skill in the art" and "predictability", etc. have been demonstrated to be sufficiently lacking in the instant case for the instant method claims. In view of the breadth of the claims, the chemical nature of the invention, the unpredictability of enzyme-inhibitor interactions in general, and the lack of working examples regarding the activity of the claimed compounds towards treating and preventing the variety of diseases of the instant claims, one having ordinary skill in the art would have to undergo an undue amount of experimentation to use the instantly claimed invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

MPEP §2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was 'filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557,1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here and undue experimentation will be required to practice Applicants' invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 5, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App.

1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd.* v. *Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Caravatti et al., Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett., 9, 1973-1978, 1999.

See page 1976, compound 10.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Katoh et al., WO 2003/016266; CA 138: 205074, 2003. CAPLUS abstract provided.

See compound shown in the CAPLUS Abstract.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be addressed to Venkataraman Balasubramanian (Bala) whose telephone number is (571) 272-0662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8.00 AM to 6.00 PM. The Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) of the art unit 1624 is James O. Wilson, whose telephone number is 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (571) 273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAG. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-2 17-9197 (toll-free).

/Venkataraman Balasubramanian/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1624
1/11/2008